

# **Report of the Accreditation Re-visit to San Francisco State University**

## **Professional Services Division**

**June 19, 2008**

### **Overview**

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to San Francisco State University that was conducted April 24-25, 2008. This item provides the report of the re-visit team and recommendations regarding six stipulations and the accreditation status.

### **Staff Recommendations**

1. That four of the six stipulations from the 2007 accreditation visit be removed and the other two be amended.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**.

### **Background Information**

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at San Francisco State University on April 14-18, 2007. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for San Francisco State University and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by the original team leader and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action.

**Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the Re-Visit team's recommendations:**

<b>Stipulations from the 2007 Visit</b>	<b>Re-Visit Teams Recommendations</b>
1. That the unit provide evidence that institutional leadership supports a vision for professional preparation programs with clear communication and articulation among all programs within the unit.	The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.
2. That the unit ensures cohesive management with	The team recommends that the

<b>Stipulations from the 2007 Visit</b>	<b>Re-Visit Teams Recommendations</b>
clear lines of authority and responsibility among all programs within the unit.	stipulation be removed.
3.That the unit provide evidence of implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all program credential areas.	The unit provides an update in one year on the implementation of the assessment system, including documentation of the utilization of the data for program improvement.
4.That the unit provide evidence that every program has a systematic fieldwork sequence that meets the program standards and that district and university field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, oriented and assessed.	The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.
5.That the unit provide evidence that all program standards less than fully met are now met.	That the unit provides evidence that the three standards that are <i>Met with Concerns</i> are fully met.
6.That the unit provide evidence that the institution provides sufficient resources to the unit in relation to the student population it is required to serve. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of resources, coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development and instruction.	That the unit provides evidence that adequate resources are allocated for the effective operation of all credential programs.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION  
ACCREDITATION TEAM RE-VISIT REPORT**

**Institution:** San Francisco State University

**Dates of Re-Visit:** April 24-25, 2008

**Original  
COA Accreditation  
Decision:** **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

**Re-visit Team Recommendations**

The team recommends that:

1. That four of the six stipulations from the 2007 accreditation visit be removed and the other two be amended.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**.

**Rationale**

Based upon the Institutional Response to the Stipulations, review of supporting evidence and interviews with faculty members, institutional administration, students, graduates, and field supervisors, the team determined that the institution has provided responses to each of the stipulations and made substantial progress towards meeting the stipulations. In addition, the institution has addressed the standards less than fully met which were identified during the accreditation visit one year ago, although not all standards are fully met yet.

**Team Leader:** **Joel A. Colbert**, Co-Chair  
Chapman University

**Staff:** **Teri Clark**, Administrator

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the site visit in 2007 followed by the 2008 institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. After this section, the revisit team findings on the NCATE/Common Standards and program standards are included.

**Findings on Stipulations**

**Stipulation #1**

**That the unit provide evidence that institutional leadership supports a vision for professional preparation programs with clear communication and articulation among all programs within the unit.**

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The SFSU College of Education (COE) reports that there is a clear vision, articulated through its conceptual framework, and that there is appropriate communication and articulation for its professional preparation programs that support this vision. To that end, the Dean meets twice monthly with the department chairs and academic coordinators. The chairs, in turn, meet at least monthly with faculty who identify and discuss relevant issues and address problems. Through this process, issues are identified, information gathered, solutions discussed and problems solved.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this stipulation prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, and staff, the team confirms that the COE has provided evidence that a clear vision is in place and that there are appropriate communication and articulation protocols.

### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #2**

**That the unit ensures cohesive management with clear lines of authority and responsibility among all programs within the unit.**

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The SFSU COE reports that there is a cohesive management structure in place with clear lines of authority among all programs within the unit. The Dean has installed a new coordinator of accreditation activities who has further defined the management structure and facilitated communication among and between unit administration, program chairs and coordinators, and faculty.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this stipulation prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty and staff, the team confirms that the COE has provided evidence that a well-defined and cohesive management structure is in place with clear lines of authority and responsibility among all programs within the unit.

### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #3**

**That the unit provide evidence of implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all program credential areas.**

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The COE has recently developed a comprehensive unit assessment system, under the direction of the new accreditation coordinator who meets regularly with all of the stakeholders at SFSU,*

*both within and outside the unit, to continue to develop the system. While the system has not been implemented yet, system development is progressing and data collection will begin in spring 2008.*

#### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this stipulation prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, and staff, the team confirms that the university is developing a unit assessment system that will provide the data necessary to make informed decisions for program improvement.

#### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team suggests a report be submitted in one year documenting the progress of the implementation of the assessment system and the formulation and implementation of a plan for using the data generated by the new assessment system for program improvement. Therefore the team recommends an amended stipulation:

**The unit provide an update in one year on the implementation of the assessment system, including documentation of the utilization of the data for program improvement.**

#### **Stipulation #4**

**That the unit provide evidence that every program has a systematic fieldwork sequence that meets the program standards and that district and university field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, oriented and assessed.**

#### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The SFSU COE reports that field experiences in all programs have been modified and refined to meet program standards and that university and district supervisors and cooperating teachers are carefully selected, trained, oriented, and assessed.*

#### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this stipulation prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, and students, the team confirms that the COE has developed program field experiences that ensure that supervisors and cooperating teachers are well-trained, oriented, and assessed. The team recommends that a coordination system for field experiences be developed to ensure that field experiences across all programs are of high quality and consistent.

#### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

#### **Stipulation #5**

**That the unit provide evidence that all program standards less than fully met are now met.**

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The COE submitted reports for each of the programs with standards less than fully met in the April 2007 accreditation visit. For each program, the program leadership and faculty have reviewed the design of the program and made appropriate modifications to address the standards.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, and students, the team confirms that the COE has made significant progress to meet all of the standards that were less than fully met. For two of the programs with findings of standards Not Met, the three standards in question are now ***Met with Concerns***.

### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team suggests that monitoring of SFSU continue for one additional year to allow the two programs that have not fully met all standards to submit additional information documenting the completion of planned activities. Therefore the team recommends that the stipulation be amended:

**That the unit provide evidence that the three standards that are *Met with Concerns* are fully met.**

### **Stipulation #6**

**That the unit provide evidence that the institution provides sufficient resources to the unit in relation to the student population it is required to serve. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of resources, coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development and instruction.**

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The SFSU COE reports that the institution does not provide adequate resources to the unit in relation to the student population it is required to serve, with inadequate resources across the campus due to statewide budget cuts. As a result, the COE does its best to effectively operate programs in terms of coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development, and assessment in spite of inadequate resources.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this stipulation prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and staff, the team confirms that resources are still insufficient but the unit has made efforts to effectively operate all programs to the level required by the standards.

### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

## NCATE/Common Standards

### Findings on NCATE/Common Standards Concerns

The accreditation team articulated concerns related to NCATE/Common standards specific to individual standards. The institution has addressed each of the concerns in the following manner:

### NCATE Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

While there is substantial candidate assessment data collected for most programs, data are not systematically summarized and used by the unit.

### Institutional Response (2008)

*The SFSU COE reports that a new accreditation coordinator has been identified and that the coordinator has worked with the administration, faculty, chairs, and coordinators to develop a new comprehensive unit assessment system that will provide systematic data on all candidates that will be used for program improvement purposes.*

### Revisit Team Findings

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this concern, prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and staff, the team confirms that a comprehensive unit assessment system is currently under development and that implementation will begin in the spring 2008. The team recommends that a progress report be submitted in one year documenting the implementation of the system and the formulation of a plan to use the data generated for continued program improvement. This standard is still **Met with Concerns**.

### NCATE Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Data are collected programmatically but are not used to inform the unit where changes are needed. There is a lack of evidence that a program assessment system is utilized across the unit.

*Rationale:* The state requirement for meeting this standard is substantially different from that of NCATE. At present, the state standard requires that designated stakeholders (program participants, graduates and local practitioners) are involved in a comprehensive evaluation of courses and field experiences that lead to substantive improvements in credential programs. It was judged that evaluation data are collected from stakeholders, but evidence of the coordination and utilization of that data was not available.

### Institutional Response (2008)

*The SFSU COE reports that a new accreditation coordinator has been identified and that the coordinator has worked with the administration, faculty, chairs, and coordinators to develop a new comprehensive unit assessment system that will provide systematic data on all candidates that will be used for program improvement purposes. The assessment system is organized around seven key categories that address the California program standards and NCATE standards. The system is integrated with the campus-wide data system and faculty report that it is easy to use.*

*Data on key assessments are entered at the same time as course grades. Programs identified the key assignments that compose the assessment system. The initial use of the system is planned for Spring 2008.*

### **Revisit Team Findings**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this concern prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, students, and staff, the team confirms that a comprehensive unit assessment system is currently under development and that implementation will begin in the spring 2008. The team recommends that a progress report be submitted in one year documenting the implementation of the system and the formulation of a plan to use the data generated for continued program improvement. This standard is still **Met with Concerns**.

### **NCATE Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

Field Experience is inconsistent across the programs. Training of master teachers and field supervisors varies depending on the program. There is no evidence of a systematic approach to training, orientation and assessment of field experiences.

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The SFSU COE reports that field experiences have been reviewed, modified and refined to ensure consistency across all programs and that university and district supervisors and cooperating teachers have been systematically and carefully selected, trained, oriented, and assessed.*

### **Revisit Team Findings**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, and students, the team confirms that the programs within the COE have developed field experiences that insure that supervisors and cooperating teachers have been well-trained, oriented, and assessed. What is not evident at this time is a coordination system for the unit to monitor field experiences that will enable unit leadership to ensure that field experiences across all programs are of high quality and consistent, but this is not required by the Commission's Common Standards. This standard is still now fully **Met**.

### **NCATE Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

Resources are inadequate given the number and complexity of programs in the unit, specifically coordinators need release time, particularly for the large programs. Furthermore, supervision of three student teachers per credit is too heavy a load, particularly for junior tenure track faculty.

Evidence reviewed indicates that inadequate resources are provided to the unit to implement the number and complexity of programs currently in operation. Evidence indicates that faculty, especially junior tenure track faculty, must devote an inordinate amount of time to supervision.



### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The SFSU COE reports that the institution does not provide adequate resources to the unit in relation to the number and complexity of programs offered, but that resources are inadequate campus-wide due to statewide budget cuts. Multiple subject faculty supervise three students per unit, while single subject and special education faculty supervise two students per unit but the multiple subject program receives an allocation comparable to the other teacher preparation programs. The Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) was 20.1 in 2006-07 and beginning in academic year 08-09, it will be lowered to 19.6.*

### **Revisit Team Findings**

Based upon a review of the Institutional Response to this concern prepared by San Francisco State University, interviews with unit leadership, program leadership, faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, and students, the team confirms that COE resources are still insufficient, especially for the number and complexity of the program offered. But the unit has made progress as is evidenced by the lowering of the SFR and the unit is working to find creative ways to operate its credential programs. This standard is now fully **Met**.

## **Multiple Subject BCLAD Credential Program**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that two program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

### **Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork**

Multiple Subject candidates are not all placed in two different grade span placements. Many candidates remain in the same class for the entire year, and do not do additional field work in a second grade span.

### **Multiple Subject Credential only: Standard Met with Concerns**

### **Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors**

Interviews with supervising practitioners in the on-campus program indicated that orientation and training are not consistently implemented. Although, university field supervisors indicated that they provide a folder of information and scheduled meetings at each school with student teachers and their supervising practitioners to review requirements, the team did not find evidence of the meetings.

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The institution has addressed the standards that were less than fully met by reviewing all student placements and thoroughly documenting each placement. All candidates are assigned to a minimum of one placement in the grades K-3 and one in grades 3-5. The Field Placement Coordinator has systematized the documentation of all field placements. The program has increased its focus on orientation and training for all supervising practitioners.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Through interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, university and field-based supervisors, the team found that all the issues identified in the visit conducted in spring 2007 have been addressed. These standards are now fully **Met**.

## Single Subject Credential Program

### Findings on Standards

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was *Not Met*.

#### Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors

Although there is evidence that a student teaching handbook is available and given to master teachers, and site administrators, as well as internship site supervisors, there is no evidence of opportunities for parties involved to “complete training in teacher development.”

#### Institutional Response (2008)

*The institution created a Student Teaching Task Force in fall 2007. The Task Force has met six times, reviewed how other universities organize their student teaching procedures and made recommendations to the department chair. The recommendations include the formation of Professional Development Schools (PDS) with a SFSU faculty member assigned to the PDS and responsible for collaborating with master teachers and site administrators at the school, providing professional development for master teachers, and being provided .20 release time to serve in the PDS. In addition, the program has an updated student teacher handbook that is provided to all master teachers and administrators. The Task Force has also recommended the formation of an Advisory Board, composed of key district administrators, to increase the communication and collaboration between the program and the field placement sites. For this year, the Field Placement Coordinator or one of the university field supervisors has visited all placement sites and met with master teachers. Beginning in fall 2007, the student teacher to faculty supervisor was reduced to 2 to 1 from 3 to 1.*

#### Revisit Team Finding

The Student Teaching Task Force has just begun its work, the Advisory Board has not yet met, and the PDS structure has not yet been implemented. The team recognizes the increased focus and efforts on the procedures related to student teaching placement and supervision but suggests a report in one year on the activities. Standard 15 is now *Met with Concerns*

## Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

### Findings on Standards

One year ago, the team determined that two program standards were *Not Met*.

#### Standard 7: Application and Reinforcement Through Field Experiences

#### Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences

Currently, there is no field placement component in the Reading Certificate Program and there is no advanced clinical experience in the Reading Specialist Credential Program. Faculty cite financial constraints as a factor. Although there is no formal field placement or advanced clinical experience, in EED 770 and EED 771, candidates administer assessments to students and make recommendations for interventions. However, there is no requirement to plan and implement lessons in the field, nor do candidates conduct interventions with struggling readers. EED 770 and EED 771 are heavily research-based, with no clinical intervention as a follow through to the assigned assessments.

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*Beginning in summer 2007, the institution reviewed its courses and revised syllabi to explicitly reflect the full range of content required by the standards. All candidates plan and implement lessons in the field and conduct interventions with struggling readers across a range of grade levels. A proposal for a course focusing on Adolescent Literacy has been submitted but not installed due to budget constraints. The COE is considering other options, (e.g. summer institutes, using class meetings for the professor to observe students in the field, and using advanced students to mentor beginning students) to meet the Standard with minimal fiscal impact.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

The definition of field experience assumes some type of clinical supervision in the field. The institution has not yet put in place field supervision for the reading programs. These standards are now **Met with Concerns**.

## **Designated Subjects: Vocational Education Teaching Credentials**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that two program standards were **Met with Concerns**.

**Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credential—Standard 12, Classroom and Laboratory Management:** While interviews indicate that tenured and tenure-line faculty have the expertise and flexibility to meet the specific needs of Designated Subjects Vocational Education teacher candidates with regard to Laboratory Management (as opposed to Classroom Management), the team did not find evidence that the program has a systematic process that ensures these students access to this credential-specific standard. Specifically, program documents, e.g., syllabi, observations protocols, do not include Laboratory Management.

**Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credential—Standard 14, Teaching Students with Special Needs:** While interviews indicate that tenured and tenure-line faculty have the expertise and flexibility to meet the specific needs of Designated Subjects Vocational Education teacher candidates, the team did not find evidence that the program has a systematic process that ensures students access to this credential-specific standard. Specifically, program documents, e.g., syllabi, observations protocols, do not explicitly address instruction for “handicapped students in vocational programs” and the “legal basis for the provision of education for ... the handicapped and relate it to their own program.”

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The institution has reviewed its courses for the inclusion of the content required by Standards 12 and 14. The course syllabi have been updated to include sessions directly related to the content of the two standards. The content required by the identified standards is covered in the required courses and in the teaching practicum.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Each candidate completes the courses and practicum where the required content is addressed. These standards are now fully **Met**.

## **Education Specialist Credential Program**

## Mild/Moderate Level I and Level II

### Findings on Standards

One year ago, the team determined that five program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

**Level I Standard 13, Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations** - The team found that there was an attempt to embed assignments which required observations of and/or interactions with students from varied areas of service and a broad spectrum of diverse populations into several courses. However, the team also found evidence that some candidates, especially intern teachers, do not participate in the breadth of experience required by this standard. Field work experiences appear minimal, varied and inconsistent. Not all candidates have the necessary variety of age, disability population, and educator role.

**Level I Standard 14, Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites** - The team found evidence of supervisors who are qualified with appropriate experience and credentials. However, overwhelming evidence from candidates confirmed that the role of the supervisor is varied, minimal (only 2-3 visits throughout the program), and predominantly focused on completing and monitoring paperwork. The team found that candidates are not receiving complete, accurate or timely feedback, nor are the supervisors providing a model consistent with best practice.

**Level I Standard 16, Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships** - The team found that minimal attention was given to instruction in communication and collaboration in the Level I program, and that supervisors in evaluating candidate competence did not focus on finding field based evidence in this area.

**Level I Standard 21, General Education Field Experiences** – The team found that candidates observed general education classes, and participated in experiences in order to fulfill course assignments. There was no evidence found that these experiences, while logged and tracked, represented a “variety of field experiences,” were in “different teaching arrangements,” and included “prompt feedback” or “guided practice from supervisors.”

**Level I Standard 23, Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction** - The team found that the aspect of planning instruction that includes IEP development was quite strong. However, candidates reported a lack of instruction in lesson design and implementation, specific pedagogy for students with mild/moderate disabilities, and content specific pedagogy in the Level I program.

### Institutional Response (2008)

*The institution has systematized fieldwork procedures such that each candidate participates in a breadth of experiences in both general and special education settings and documents these experiences in a portfolio. The documentation includes reflections and observation notes and the candidates receive feedback. The program has been awarded a five-year grant from the USDOE. The grant is supporting the restructuring and redesign of the Level I program, including augmenting the clinical experiences and supervision of all candidates. Included in the work related to the grant is an increased focus on lesson design that is aligned to the IEP goals, and content standards and is linked to instructional strategies and interventions. The review of candidates’ portfolios by faculty members is systematized.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Through interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, university and field-based supervisors, the team found that all the issues identified in the visit conducted in spring 2007 have been addressed. These standards are now fully **Met**.

## **Moderate/Severe: Level I and Level II**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that two program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

#### **Standard 13: Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations.**

Not all candidates assume the responsibilities of a full-time teacher, however they do assume some of the responsibilities or all of the responsibilities for some of the student case load. There is a concern that not all candidates are prepared for the rigors of full-time work in the public schools. Candidates have field work opportunities with elementary and secondary inclusion programs. Although the program encourages candidates to experience both elementary and secondary programs, evidence indicates that not all candidates have field experiences across the age/grade ranges that are authorized by the credential. Candidates can complete credential requirements with varied experiences in inclusive settings, but no experience in Special Day Classes. This leaves the candidates unprepared for a program option used in many school districts across the state.

#### **Standard 16: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships:**

Candidates are not required by the program to have experience with students aged 16-22, and many only have experience with one age level, but they do design lessons/modifications in their coursework.

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The institution ensures and documents that all candidates participate in a range of field experiences across elementary and secondary schools, across the range of settings, and with 16-22 year old students. Field experiences are documented on a revised "tracking form."*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Through interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, university and field-based supervisors, the team found that all the issues identified in the visit conducted in spring 2007 have been addressed. These standards are now fully **Met**.

## **Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential**

### **Findings on Standards**

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was *Met with Concerns* and three program standards were *Not Met* in the Preliminary Administrative Services program. Additionally, five program standards were *Not Met* in the Professional Administrative Services program.

### ***Preliminary Administrative Services Credential***

#### **Standard Met with Concerns**

**Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback.** More emphasis is needed on the relationship between standards and field experience activities.

#### **Standards Not Met**

**Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design.** Better communication is needed in advising students through the scope and sequence of the program. In addition, no planned process is evident for comprehensive assessment of individual candidates on all competencies.

**Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences.** There is no evidence of requiring placement of candidates in a variety of school levels and settings

**Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance.** There is no evidence of at least one supervisor involved in assessment. In addition, there is no observable evidence of periodic evaluation of assessment practices.

### ***Professional Administrative Services Credential***

#### **Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination**

There is no evidence of effective coordination and communication between the institution and the candidates.

#### **Standard 6: Provision of Mentoring Experiences**

There is no evidence of provision of mentoring experiences.

#### **Standard 7: Mentor Qualifications**

No evidence of mentor qualifications was found.

#### **Standard 8: Expectations of Candidate Performance**

Expectations for candidate performance are not clearly communicated to the candidates at the beginning of the program.

#### **Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

There is no evidence of candidate competency rubrics to reflect attainment goals of the final portfolio and there is no evidence of a mentor's assessment of the final portfolio.

### **Institutional Response (2008)**

*The institution completed the document submission and approval process for both its administrative services credential programs to address the revised administrative services standards (2003) in summer 2007. The expectations for the program are clearly communicated to each candidate by the full-time faculty members. Guidance and feedback are provided to all candidates on a routine basis.*

### **Revisit Team Finding**

At the visit in spring 2007, the revised program document had not been completed or approved. In spring 2008, through interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, university and field-based

supervisors, the team found that all the issues identified in the original visit have been addressed. These standards are now fully **Met**.